

Universal Leakage Elimination

Mark S. Byrd¹, Daniel A. Lidar², Lian-Ao Wu², and Paolo Zanardi³

1. *Physics Department, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901-4401,*

2. *Chemical Physics Theory Group, Chemistry Department,
and Center for Quantum Information and Quantum Control,*

University of Toronto, 80 St. George St., Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada

3. *Institute for Scientific Interchange (ISI), Villa Gualino, Viale Settimio Severo 65, I-10133 Torino, Italy*

“Leakage” errors are particularly serious errors which couple states within a code subspace to states outside of that subspace thus destroying the error protection benefit afforded by an encoded state. We generalize an earlier method for producing leakage elimination decoupling operations and examine the effects of the leakage eliminating operations on decoherence-free or noiseless subsystems which encode one logical, or protected qubit into three or four qubits. We find that by eliminating the large class of leakage errors, under some circumstances, we can create the conditions for a decoherence free evolution. In other cases we identify a combination decoherence-free and quantum error correcting code which could eliminate errors in solid-state qubits with anisotropic exchange interaction Hamiltonians and enable universal quantum computing with only these interactions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Noise protection for quantum information processing is an important facet of quantum control and the design of quantum devices. In quantum computing, coherent control of a quantum system is required in order to take advantage of quantum computing speed-ups. A great deal of work has been done, and is still ongoing, to try to achieve multi-particle control for quantum information processing. In order to implement noiseless control of quantum computing systems, several methods of error prevention have been introduced. Quantum error correcting codes (QECCs) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], detect and correct errors, decoherence-free or noiseless, subsystems (DFSs) [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] avoid noises in quantum systems and dynamical decoupling controls (DD) [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] reduce the errors by averaging or symmetrizing them away. Since none of these has seen the ultimate success of preventing errors in a prototypical quantum computing device, combinations of more than one of these methods have been explored [17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37]. One particularly promising example is the combination of dynamical decoupling controls with decoherence-free subsystems [17, 19, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38]. This combination can offer several advantages; it can 1) reduce the number of physical qubits required to encode one logical qubit, 2) can enable universal control in systems which cannot be completely controlled otherwise, 3) can avoid noises, 4) can reduce noises even if they are not eliminated or avoided. Such combinations are very likely to be necessary for the near-term and longer term goals associated with reliable quantum information processing. (For a recent review on error prevention, see [39]).

For those quantum computing proposals which use quantum dots for storing information and the Heisenberg exchange interaction for performing gating interactions, a DFS encoding is promising since it enables universal computing without the need for single qubit gates [11, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. Architecturally, as well

as for speed, single qubit gates can be difficult to implement for unencoded (i.e., physical) qubits in solid-state systems. It has been shown that, for several different types of interactions, and for several different encodings, decoherence-free subspaces provide the ability to perform universal quantum computing without requiring single qubit gates [11, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. It is therefore important to know the conditions for a DFS to exist or, as discussed in this paper, what methods might be used to create a DFS. For those circumstances which do not allow for a DFS implementation alone in order to eliminate all noise in the system, what is (are) the best method(s) for error protection? This clearly depends on the physical system and an analysis of the types of occurring errors will be necessary in order to take advantage of every possible technique for noise suppression, correction and/or avoidance.

In this paper we discuss the elimination of leakage errors. Leakage errors destroy a subspace encoding by coupling states within the encoded subspace of the system Hilbert space with the states which are outside of the code subspace. These are particularly serious errors since they eliminate the usefulness of a subspace encoding. Moreover, they cannot be handled by standard QECC methods under the assumption of a set of operations restricted to act on a subspace [50]. We will first review the bang-bang limit of the dynamical decoupling controls and the algebraic decomposition of the operators on the Hilbert space in Section II in order to make the article more self-contained. We then review, in Section III, the definition and construction of leakage elimination operators (LEOs) using canonical gates and then generalize the construction to gates which are not canonical. In Section IV we provide an explicit decomposition of the algebra of operators for the 3-qubit DFS and use it to classify all errors on the DFS. In this section, we also analyze the errors which commonly arise in solid-state implementations of quantum computing proposals in terms of the basis set we have constructed and determine a strategy for eliminating all errors, in addition to leakage errors,

which arise from anisotropic exchange errors and cause decoherence. In the following section, Section V, we construct a physically available LEO which is not made of canonical gates using the construction in Section III. We then analyze errors in the 4-qubit DFS which arise in solid-state implementations of QC. We then summarize our results in the Conclusion.

II. UNIVERSAL LEAKAGE ELIMINATION

In this section we briefly review dynamical decoupling controls, symmetrization and the results of [37]. For a more detailed discussion of dynamical decoupling controls, the reader is referred to [51], for the group-theoretical underpinnings see [29], for an empirical approach see [19, 31], for a geometrical approach see [23] or [39, 51] for recent reviews. We then provide a general formula for producing a leakage elimination operator (LEO).

A. Dynamical Decoupling Controls

Dynamical decoupling controls are control pulses which are used to average away noises in a quantum system. When hard, fast pulses are used, these are commonly referred to as bang-bang controls. Here we review decoupling controls in the bang-bang limit.

Consider a general Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = H_S + H_B + H_{SB},$$

where H_S acts only on the system, H_B acts only on the bath, and $H_I = H_{SB} = \sum_{\gamma} S_{\gamma} \otimes B_{\gamma}$ couples the system to the bath. Let us now implement control operations, U_i , periodically with the system undergoing free unitary evolution (by H) for a time Δt between control operations. If we assume that the free evolution is negligible during the time the control is “on” (this assumes “strong” control Hamiltonians are available.), then we obtain an effective unitary evolution for the combined system-bath:

$$U_{eff} \approx \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} U_i \exp[-iH\Delta t] U_i^{\dagger}. \quad (1)$$

If we also assume that H is approximately constant during the application of the set of pulses $\{U_i\}$ (This assumes that we can apply the pulses quickly on the system-bath interaction time-scale.), then we may also use an effective Hamiltonian to describe this evolution,

$$H_{eff} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} U_i H U_i^{\dagger}. \quad (2)$$

In an ideal circumstances (as $N \rightarrow \infty$), we can eliminate H_{SB} completely so as to decouple the system and

bath. However, *in this paper we combine decoupling operations with an encoding, therefore we only require that H_{SB} be modified. This drastically reduces the demands on a physical system.*

One should note that “strong” and “fast” are relative to system-bath interactions, notions which have been thoroughly quantified in [52]. In addition, we need not require strong pulses in some cases [51, 53] and in other cases, the fast requirement can be relatively easily satisfied [54, 55]. In this paper, we will consider dynamical decoupling controls which assume hard, fast pulses, but we note that appropriate controls may be available which can serve as decoupling pulses without the necessity of the “bang-bang” limit.

As a final remark on decoupling operations, we state the following theorem [31, 32] which follows from [29]:

Theorem II.1 *Dynamical decoupling with respect to the set of logical operations of an encoded qubit can be used to completely decouple the dynamics of the encoded subspace from the bath.*

This theorem is important for the following reasons. First, the number of pulses required to eliminate noise on physical qubits can be quite taxing on physical resources. If we restrict ourselves to logical operations, we can reduce the number of required pulses dramatically. Second, in many cases, if we use logical operations to remove errors, we are restricting to those operations which are available in experiment. Often an encoding is chosen for its universality considerations. In other words, many codes are chosen so that universal quantum computing can be performed on a subspace even if it cannot be performed on the entire Hilbert space. Those operations which achieve universal control, can also be used for complete decoupling.

B. Algebraic Decomposition

In order to discuss the effects of the dynamical decoupling operations on encoded qubits, we will briefly review the decomposition of the algebra [10, 56] which can describe all error prevention schemes [57].

The interaction algebra, denoted $\mathcal{A}$, is generated by the set $\{H_S, S_{\gamma}\}$. This algebra is, in general, reducible and can be closed under Hermitian conjugation (meaning $\mathcal{A}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{A}$). This algebra is a subalgebra of the full set of endomorphisms of the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, $\text{End}(\mathcal{H})$ which are linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The irreducible components of this algebra are described by the decomposition

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathcal{J}} I_{n_J} \otimes M(d_J, \mathbb{C}), \quad (3)$$

where the J , a shorthand for all relevant representation indices, label the irreducible representations and the $M(d_J, \mathbb{C})$ are $d_J \times d_J$ complex matrices. This representation is a direct sum decomposition (block diagonal) with

n_J labelling the states of the system in the corresponding Hilbert space decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} \cong \bigoplus_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{C}^{n_J} \otimes \mathbb{C}_J^d. \quad (4)$$

Each factor $\mathbb{C}^{n_J}$ corresponds to a noiseless subsystem. The commutant of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted $\mathcal{A}'$, is in $\text{End}(\mathcal{H})$ and is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}' = \{X \in \text{End}(\mathcal{H}) \mid [X, \mathcal{A}] = 0\}. \quad (5)$$

The existence of a decoherence-free, or noiseless, subsystem is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{A}' = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathcal{J}} M(n_J, \mathbb{C}) \otimes I_{d_J} \neq \mathbb{C}I. \quad (6)$$

This implies a non-trivial group of symmetries of the commutant. The unitary part of $\mathcal{A}'$, $U(\mathcal{A}')$, is the set of unitary symmetries of the error algebra $\mathcal{A}$.

Note that DFSs, QECCs and topological codes can all be described by this same algebraic decomposition [57]. We can therefore generically discuss encoded qubits in the context of quantum error prevention without regard to the type of encoding although we will primarily direct our attention to DFSs.

III. LEAKAGE AND LEAKAGE ELIMINATION OPERATORS (LEOS)

Qubits can be either a subspace of a larger system Hilbert space or an encoded subspace of a larger Hilbert space. The idealized, isolated two-level system never occurs in nature, when all energy scales are taken into account. We therefore seek to eliminate, or reduce the difference between an idealized qubit and the approximate two-level systems available in experiments. Whether these are two physical states in a larger Hilbert space, or a state which is encoded into some set of states through a non-trivial transformation, we will discuss a generalized notion of a code and encoded subspace. This encoded subspace, or codespace, will be denoted $\mathcal{C}$. The orthogonal complement of the codespace, also a subspace of the system Hilbert space, will be denoted $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. Our objective will be to eliminate the coupling between $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. We refer to such errors as leakage errors. However, unlike considerations of leakage introduced during logical, or gating operations [5, 47, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62], we will consider residual errors and errors introduced by system-bath couplings as in [37].

Let us first consider the simple case of a physical or encoded qubit. In this case we would like to eliminate the leakage from a two-level system within an N -level system. We will choose an ordered basis for the N -level system Hilbert space $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$ such that the code $\mathcal{C}$ will be represented by some combination of the first 2-levels. The algebra of operations on the system Hilbert space can then be classified in the following way,

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, E^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}, L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ F & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where B and C are 2×2 and $(N-2) \times (N-2)$ blocks respectively, and D, F are $2 \times (N-2)$ and $(N-2) \times 2$ blocks respectively. Operators of the type E represent logical operations, i.e., they act entirely within the code subspace. $E^\perp$ operations act only on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ and thus have no effect on the qubit subspace [63]. Finally, L represents the leakage operators. This decomposition, for physical or encoded qubits is quite general and the operators B act only on the logical qubit labels.

Generally, modifying the Hamiltonian (more specifically, the system-bath interaction Hamiltonian) through the use of dynamical decoupling controls can change the conditions under which quantum information is protected against errors. Clearly, this is accomplished by modifying the set $\{H_S, S_\gamma\}$, which modifies the interaction algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and thus the irreducible components of $\mathcal{A}$. For example, we can create DFSs where none were possible without such a modification by inducing a symmetry [17, 19, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38]. We could also eliminate correlated errors thus changing the requirements for a QECC. As described in Section II A, dynamical decoupling controls can be seen as a projection onto a subspace of the space of operators acting on the system Hilbert space.

More to the point of this paper, we can eliminate some of the components of the interaction algebra by eliminating some of the S_γ (or some combination thereof). In our case, we seek to eliminate leakage. We therefore give a general classification of elements of the algebra according to their effect on the code space. The elements of the interaction algebra $\{A_i\} = \mathcal{A}$, will be classified as $\{E_i\} \subset \mathcal{A}$, which act on the code, $\{E_i^\perp\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ which effect the orthogonal subspace, and leakage errors $\{L_i\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ which couple the elements of the code $\mathcal{C}$ with states in the orthogonal subspace $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

From the general decomposition of the algebra in Section II B, we should note the following facts. One can always decompose the algebra in terms of a set $\mathcal{O}$ which acts on the system Hilbert space and a set $\mathcal{E}$ which acts on the Hilbert space of the environment. These sets can be taken to be Hermitian operators with complex coefficients. The set of operators may then always be expressed as some linear combination of tensor products of the two sets with complex coefficients. This implies that, although the symmetries appropriate for a DFS may not always exist, we may always use a DFS-compatible basis. This will be important in Sections IV and V where we will discuss a basis for which a code can be constructed which will protect against errors, even when no symmetry in the operator algebra exists initially.

A. Canonical LEOs

In the simplest case of a “parity-kick” bang-bang control [13, 18, 56], the decoupling sequence produces the

effective evolution:

$$H_{eff} \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^1 U_i H U_i^\dagger, \quad (8)$$

i.e., there is only one non-trivial decoupling pulse ($U_0 \equiv I$) [64]. We will restrict our attention to parity-kick pulses due to time constraints which restricts the number of pulses that can be applied in many physical systems.

Abstractly, we can state the consequences of the parity-kick pulse sequence as follows. Given any subspace $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{H}$, there is a canonically associated $\mathbb{Z}_2$ group (the cyclic group of order two). This group is generated by the operator $R_L := \exp(i\pi\Pi_{\mathcal{C}})$, where $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the projector onto the code space $\mathcal{C}$. In the language of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded spaces, this operator is a parity operator, i.e., $R_L^2 = I$, inducing a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading of the state space. This means that $\mathcal{H}$ splits as a direct sum, $\mathcal{H}^{(0)} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{(1)}$, of two orthogonal subspaces: the odd (even) sector $\mathcal{H}^{(0)} = \mathcal{C}$ ($\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$). This grading can be lifted to the operator algebra over $\mathcal{H}$ turning this (Lie) algebra into a super- or $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie algebra. Operators commuting (anticommuting) with R_L are referred to as even (odd). Let $X \in \text{End}(\mathcal{H})$; the even sector of the algebra is given by $\{X \mid [R_L, X] = 0\}$ (i.e., $R_L X R_L^\dagger = X$) and the odd sector of the algebra is given by $\{X \mid \{R_L, X\} = 0\}$ (i.e., $R_L X R_L^\dagger = -X$).

As an example, let us suppose that all S_γ are in the odd sector of the algebra. According to the pulse sequence, Eq. (8), any $H_{SB} = S_\gamma \otimes B_\gamma$, odd, in the system-bath Hamiltonian will be removed after a complete set of operations. Therefore when all S_γ are odd, complete decoupling is achievable using only R_L .

Now consider a *leakage-elimination operator* (LEO) as in [37]

$$R_L = e^{i\phi} \begin{pmatrix} -I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where the blocks have the same dimensions as in Eq. (7) and $\exp(i\phi)$ is an overall phase factor. This operator anticommutes with the leakage operators $\{R_L, L\} = 0$, while $[R_L, E] = [R_L, E^\perp] = 0$. Clearly such a sequence exactly produces the grading of the algebra described in the previous section. R_L is an LEO since it follows that the following (parity-kick) sequence eliminates the leakage errors:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e^{-iHt/n} R_L^\dagger e^{-iHt/n} R_L)^n = e^{-iH_E t} e^{-iH^\perp t}, \quad (10)$$

where H_E ($H^\perp$) corresponds to part of the error algebra which affects only $\mathcal{C}$ ($\mathcal{C}^\perp$). To physically implement this, in practice one takes $n = 1$ and makes the time t very small compared to the bath correlation time as discussed in Section II A. Eq. (10) then holds to order t^2 , and implies that one intersperses periods of free evolution for time t with R_L , $R_L^\dagger$ strong pulses. The term $e^{-iH^\perp t}$ in Eq. (10) has no effect on the qubit subspace. The term $e^{-iH_E t}$ may result in logical errors, which will have to

be treated by other methods, e.g., concatenation with a QECC [28, 65, 66], or additional BB pulses [16, 23, 31]. Therefore, in order to eliminate *leakage*, we seek an LEO for a given encoding, which is obtainable from a controllable system Hamiltonian H_S acting for a time τ , i.e., $R_L = \exp(-iH_S \tau)$.

In [37], several examples were given of physical systems which, formally, have logical operations which are also naturally projective (i.e., they act as projections onto the code subspace). Such operations were termed canonical. As mentioned above, in some situations, the physically available (and controllable) interactions do not include operations which are also projections. We will provide one important example in Section V, the four-qubit DFS in a solid state system which uses Heisenberg exchange interactions for gating operations. In this case it is highly desirable to have a more general method for producing the appropriate LEO which does not include a projection. Next we will provide a generalized LEO which circumvents the need for canonical gating operations, before discussing the LEOs for the three- and four-qubit DFSs.

B. Generalized LEO

Generally, when a canonical logical operation is experimentally available, we can construct an LEO using the methods from [37] where the projector $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ is redundant. In fact, an operator of the following form serves as an LEO,

$$R_L = \exp(-i\pi\sigma_L). \quad (11)$$

where σ_L any operation such that $\sigma_L = \sigma_L^\dagger$, $\sigma_L^2 = I$ on the code space, and $\sigma_L |\psi\rangle = 0$ for any $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^\perp$. The primary example is when σ_L is a canonical logical operation. Such is the case for the 3-qubit DFS which uses Heisenberg exchange for logical gating operations, as will be shown later (see also [37]).

A more general characterization of an LEO is the following. Let the Hamiltonian for an LEO be given by

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & 0 \\ 0 & H_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where H_1 acts on the code subspace and H_2 on the orthogonal subspace. If H_1 is diagonal with even (odd) integers as the diagonal elements and H_2 is diagonal with odd (even) integers as the diagonal elements, then one may write the LEO as

$$R_L = U \exp(-i\pi H) U^\dagger \quad (13)$$

where $U = U_1 \oplus U_2$ is a direct sum (block diagonal). In this case H is not projective since it has non-zero eigenvalues when acting on the subspace orthogonal to the code. The effective LEO, however, is unchanged, i.e., the form Eq. (9) is obtained, which again produces a

$\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading of the algebra and thus eliminates leakage errors as desired. Such is the case for the four-qubit DFS example in Section V.

C. Leakage Elimination to/from a Subspace

Given the form of the operators that cause leakage, Eq. (7) and the form of the leakage elimination operator Eq. (9), we in fact have the choice to eliminate leakage between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ either by acting on $\mathcal{C}$, or by action on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

The advantage of the first, is that, in principle, we may use Theorem II.1 ([31, 32]), or the methods of [19], to eliminate all errors on the encoded state space, even the logical errors. This requires (in many cases) acting on the codespace with logical operations. If, however, we do not have the experimental capabilities to implement the operations quickly enough for the given bath, or if the operations are imperfect, such operations may make cause more errors in the system [52]. However, we may choose to apply the alternative of operating on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. If the states are properly confined to the codespace, then $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ states should not be occupied, and decoupling pulses will have no effect. If the $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ states are becoming populated, then the decoupling pulses applied to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ will eliminate leakage. As long as the decoupling pulses are properly constrained to act purely on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ then this results in increased tolerance to other pulse imperfections, in the sense that states in $\mathcal{C}$ are unaffected. As we will see, in the case of the three- and four-qubit DFSs, a large class of errors are leakage type errors. Therefore decoupling with respect to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ could serve as an effective error suppression method in those cases where direct action on the codespace is inadvisable.

IV. LEOS AND THE 3-QUBIT DFS

The three qubit DFS encodes one logical qubit using a subsystem of three physical qubits. It is the most efficient way in which to protect a single logical qubit from collective errors of any type (bit-flip, phase-flip, or both) [67]. It has been shown that the exchange interaction is sufficient for implementing a universal set of gating operations on this system while preserving the DFS [11]. In this section we will consider the effects of an LEO on this DFS and examine ways in which to protect information which is encoded in this subsystem.

A. 3-qubit DFS

We will represent the three-qubit DFS encoded qubit in the following way, where $|0\rangle = |1/2\rangle, |1\rangle = |-1/2\rangle$ are the two states of a single spin-1/2 (Note that this

convention is opposite to that of reference [11]):

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} (|010\rangle - |100\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ (|011\rangle - |101\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ (2|001\rangle - |010\rangle - |100\rangle)/\sqrt{6} \\ (-2|110\rangle + |011\rangle + |101\rangle)/\sqrt{6} \\ |000\rangle \\ (|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle)/\sqrt{3} \\ (|011\rangle + |101\rangle + |110\rangle)/\sqrt{3} \\ |111\rangle \end{array} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |0_L\rangle \\ |1_L\rangle \\ \mathcal{C}^\perp \end{array} \right. \quad (14)$$

This notation means that $|0_L\rangle = \alpha_0(|010\rangle - |100\rangle)/\sqrt{2} + \beta_0(|011\rangle - |101\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ (arbitrary superposition), and likewise $|1_L\rangle = \alpha_1(2|001\rangle - |010\rangle - |100\rangle)/\sqrt{6} + \beta_1(-2|110\rangle + |011\rangle + |101\rangle)/\sqrt{6}$. The logical zero ($|0_L\rangle$) and logical one ($|1_L\rangle$) comprise the code subspace $\mathcal{C}$. These states belong to the two $J = 1/2$ irreducible representations (irreps) of $SU(2)$. The coefficients are then the Wigner-Clebsch-Gordan coefficients [68] and the last 4 states comprise a $J = 3/2$ representation of $SU(2)$. The two $J = 1/2$ irreps can be distinguished by a degeneracy label $\lambda = 0, 1$. Thus a basis state in the eight-dimensional Hilbert space is fully identified by the three quantum numbers $|J, \lambda, \mu\rangle$, where μ is the z -component of the total spin J . In this notation we can write $|0_L\rangle = \alpha_0|1/2, 0, 1/2\rangle + \beta_0|1/2, 0, -1/2\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle = \alpha_1|1/2, 1, 1/2\rangle + \beta_1|1/2, 1, -1/2\rangle$.

B. Gating Operations for the 3-qubit DFS

Physical gates were given in Refs. [11, 42, 69] and shown to be compatible with the DFS. The gates derived in Ref. [11] are generated by the Heisenberg exchange interaction between pairs of physical qubits:

$$E_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(I + \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j), \quad (15)$$

where $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ is the vector of Pauli matrices. As written E_{ij} is the exchange operation between qubits i and j , i.e., $E_{ij}|\phi\rangle_i|\psi\rangle_j = |\psi\rangle_i|\phi\rangle_j$. The logical “X” operation is given by [11]

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(E_{23} - E_{13}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_2, \quad (16)$$

where we have labeled the rows and columns by the basis elements $\{|J = 1/2, \lambda = 0\rangle, |J = 1/2, \lambda = 1\rangle, |J = 3/2, \lambda = 0\rangle\}$, and I_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix which accounts for the fact that the action of E_{ij} is independent of the μ label (z -component of J) of the basis states. The logical “Z” operation is given by [70]

$$\bar{Z} = \frac{1}{3}(E_{13} + E_{23} - 2E_{12}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_2, \quad (17)$$

and $\bar{Y}$ can be obtained from these two by commutation.

Recall that any operator can be decomposed in terms of a linear combination of traceless, Hermitian matrices (plus the identity) with complex coefficients. The exponentiation of the set of traceless, Hermitian operators with real coefficients will give the set of unitary transformations on the Hilbert space. Thus a Hermitian basis can be used to decompose the error operators and Hamiltonians on the set of quantum states.

Here we will give a complete set of 64 operators on the space of three qubits (63 traceless and the identity) and identify the logical operators, collective operators, and leakage operators. This enables the identification of various types of noise which can occur on the DFS and their effect on the code. Our primary concern will be leakage errors and a leakage elimination operator (LEO).

We note that it is also possible to eliminate all noises which are not collective, thus producing the conditions for a DFS [19, 21, 29, 34]. The decomposition of the errors in terms of basis elements and the identification of the types of errors (leakage, collective, logical) on the code, will be useful for identifying the type of error correction procedure which should be used to correct errors affecting the code.

C. The DFS-Basis

As we saw above, collective errors on the DFS set of states act to mix the two states within the $|0_L\rangle$ -subspace (and simultaneously those within the $|1_L\rangle$ -subspace), but do not mix the two subspaces with each other. Thus we use the labels 0_L and 1_L to identify the two-state subsystem used for storing quantum information. This set of states is related to the standard set (computational basis set, $|000\rangle, \dots, |111\rangle$) through a transformation we will denote U_{dfs} , and which can be read off directly from Eq. (14):

$$U_{dfs}^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Circuits for implementing logic gates on the 3-qubit DFS were given in Refs. [11, 42, 69]. Here we take a different approach. Rather than examining the DFS in the physical basis, as in Refs. [11, 42, 69], we examine the DFS in the DFS-basis where the code and the effects of logical operators and leakage errors are more transparent. This DFS-basis will be denoted with a tilde ($\tilde{\cdot}$). This distinguishes a set of operators acting on the code from the physical gating operators. The two sets of operators

are related by the DFS transformation $U_{dfs} \mathcal{O} U_{dfs}^\dagger = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. In the DFS-basis operators take the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,1}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{1/2,3/2} \\ \hline \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,0}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,1}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,0}^{1/2,3/2} \\ \hline \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{3/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,1}^{3/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{3/2,3/2} \end{array} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{J_1, J_2}$ is a $(2J_1 + 1) \times (2J_2 + 1)$ -dimensional block coupling $|J_1, \lambda_1\rangle$ states with $|J_2, \lambda_2\rangle$ states. In the DFS-basis, states are represented, using the notation of subsection IV A, as vectors of the form $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_{-3/2}, \gamma_{-1/2}, \gamma_{1/2}, \gamma_{3/2})^t$, where the α, β -coefficients belong to the $J = 1/2$ subsystems, and where the γ -coefficients belong to the $J = 3/2$ subspace.

The advantage of the DFS-basis is this: In the DFS-basis every operator can be decomposed into a tensor product of the form $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\mu \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_J$, where each operator acts on the corresponding quantum number in a state $|J, \lambda, \mu\rangle$.

D. Decomposition of the Algebra

In [37], leakage errors between blocks B and C were treated. Here we will carry this analysis further and investigate the types of errors which may arise according to the algebraic decomposition and their effect on the code. Note that the matrices in Eq. (7) are 8×8 matrices with B, C, D, F all being 4×4 blocks. Out of these, only D and F represent leakage processes, so that there are a total of 32 independent such errors. In the DFS-basis these leakage errors between the $J = 1/2$ and $J = 3/2$ subspaces have a simple representation. In terms of Eq. (19) they appear as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{leak}} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} & & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{1/2,3/2} \\ \hline & & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,0}^{1/2,3/2} \\ \hline \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{3/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,1}^{3/2,1/2} & \end{array} \right). \quad (20)$$

The non-zero, off-diagonal blocks are $2 \times (2(1/2) + 1) \times (2(3/2) + 1) = 4 \times 4$ matrices, while $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{leak}}$ is 8×8 . It is then clear that we can construct an operator basis for the leakage errors using the DFS-basis as follows:

$$\tilde{X} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_J, \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{Y} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_J, \quad (21)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_J \in \{\tilde{I}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}\}$, i.e., each $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$, $i = \lambda, \mu$ is a Pauli matrix, or the identity matrix, in the DFS-basis. The role of $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Y}$ (which act on the J factor) is to put the 4×4 matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_J$ on the off-diagonal, as in Eq. (20).

Similarly, a logical operator takes the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{logic}} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,0}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{0,1}^{1/2,1/2} \\ \hline \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,0}^{1/2,1/2} & \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{1,1}^{1/2,1/2} \end{array} \right), \quad (22)$$

(a non-zero 4×4 block) and, e.g., the logical σ_x appears as

$$\bar{\sigma}_x = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} I & & \\ \hline I & & \\ \hline I & & \end{array} \right). \quad (23)$$

Thus, the logical basis elements for the 3-qubit DFS code are represented simply by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_x &= \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z}) \otimes \tilde{X} \otimes \tilde{I} \\ \bar{\sigma}_y &= \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z}) \otimes \tilde{Y} \otimes \tilde{I} \\ \bar{\sigma}_z &= \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z}) \otimes \tilde{Z} \otimes \tilde{I}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The factor $(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})/2$ in these tensor products acts as a projection onto the codespace. Therefore these operations act as ordinary Pauli matrices on $\mathcal{C}$, or the $0_L - 1_L$ block of the code and are canonical operators in our sense (note that they also preserve the μ factors of $|0_L\rangle, |1_L\rangle$). As we have seen in the previous section, these can be implemented using Heisenberg exchange interactions between qubits. Thus *a canonical LEO is experimentally available in systems which use Heisenberg exchange operations for gating and are encoded in the 3-qubit DFS.*

The DFS logical states $|\Psi_L\rangle = a|0_L\rangle + b|1_L\rangle$ are, by construction, invariant under collective errors. The (unnormalized) generators of collective errors are $S_\alpha = \sum \sigma_i^\alpha$, $\alpha = x, y, z$. To express these operators in the DFS basis, we transform by U_{dfs} :

$$S_X = (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + \sqrt{3}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{X} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Y} \quad (25)$$

$$S_Y = (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} + \sqrt{3}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Y} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{X} \quad (26)$$

$$S_Z = (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Z} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Z} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{I} = \tilde{I}\tilde{I}\tilde{Z} + (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{I}. \quad (27)$$

This may appear to be a less convenient form than the form of the operators in the physical basis, but in fact the interpretation is quite simple. For example, consider the term $(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X}$ appearing in S_X ; in the DFS basis it is represented by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} X & & \\ \hline & X & \\ \hline & & \end{array} \right), \quad (28)$$

i.e., it corresponds to an identical action on the two $J = 1/2$ subsystems, which is the signature of a collective error. Of course, the terms $(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y}$, $(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Z}$ have a similar interpretation. The remaining terms appearing in Eqs. (25)-(27) are all projections on the orthogonal subspace $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, since they contain the factor $(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})$. Thus they do not cause any errors on the DFS.

These observations facilitate the completion of the basis. Consider next the basis for operations on the orthogonal subspace $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ which are analogous to the logical operations on $\mathcal{C}$. These can be determined from the set (24) by simply replacing the projector $(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})$ by $(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})$. However, in order to keep all basis elements linearly independent, in particular orthogonal to S_Z , we must modify $\bar{\sigma}_z^\perp$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_x^\perp &= (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{I} \\ \bar{\sigma}_y^\perp &= (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{I} \\ \bar{\sigma}_z^\perp &= 2\tilde{I}\tilde{I}\tilde{Z} - (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{I}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We now complete the 64 element orthogonal basis for the algebra [71] Consider first the collective X error, Eq. (25). The following four elements, appearing in S_X , and whose interpretation as errors that either leave the DFS invariant or annihilate it was discussed above, span a 4-dimensional subspace of the algebra:

$$(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X}, (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X}, (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{X}, (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Y} \quad (30)$$

To find a set of operators which are mutually orthogonal and orthogonal to S_X , we use the following procedure. First we normalize the collective X error (with an overall factor of $1/\sqrt{6}$). We then require that the set of mutually orthogonal operators, (30), be taken from the set of orthogonal basis elements, to another set of orthogonal elements. The appropriate mapping is an element of $SO(4)$ since it maps four orthonormal vectors to four orthonormal vectors. Therefore, form an $SO(4)$ matrix whose first column elements are all $1/\sqrt{6}$, and whose remaining three columns provide the following coefficients (the set formed in this way is not unique):

$$S_{X_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{X} - \sqrt{\frac{5}{6}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Y} \quad (31)$$

$$S_{X_2} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} \quad (32)$$

$$S_{X_3} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{X} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{X}, \quad (33)$$

The result is three additional orthonormal basis elements which all act trivially on the DFS.

The same procedure can be used for the collective Y error [Eq. (26)] to obtain the following set of trivially-

acting errors:

$$S_{Y_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Y} - \sqrt{\frac{5}{6}}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{X} \quad (34)$$

$$S_{Y_2} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} \quad (35)$$

$$S_{Y_3} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}}(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{I}\tilde{Y} \\ + \frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}. \quad (36)$$

Some of the lack of symmetry can be remedied by a different choice for the $SO(4)$ matrix. However, no significant simplification is obtained. The (diagonal) collective Z error may be completed by finding the remaining elements in the set of eight diagonal elements which span the subspace of diagonal elements of the algebra (the Cartan subalgebra). We now choose elements to complete the basis, including this set. We start with the following diagonal matrices

$$\tilde{Z}\tilde{I}\tilde{Z}, \quad \tilde{Z}\tilde{I}\tilde{I}, \quad (37)$$

which clearly also act as collective errors. Counting indicates there are 14 remaining basis elements. These can be taken to be

$$(\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Z}, \quad (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Z}, \quad (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{X}, \\ (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{Y}, \quad (\tilde{I} - \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{Z}, \quad (38)$$

which act to annihilate the DFS; and

$$(\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{X}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}\tilde{Z}, \\ (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{X}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Y}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Y}\tilde{Z}, \\ (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{X}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{Y}, \quad (\tilde{I} + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}\tilde{Z}, \quad (39)$$

which act non-trivially on the DFS in that they mix the μ factors of $|0_L\rangle, |1_L\rangle$.

One may verify that we have enumerated 64 basis elements, with the property that they are trace orthogonal and therefore span the space of three-qubit operators. These were chosen compatible with the appropriate subspaces of the three-qubit DFS. The advantage of explicitly listing a complete set of basis elements is that we may now classify the operators and their actions on the code space.

E. Classification of Errors

In this subsection we classify the different types of operators in terms of how they affect the three-qubit DFS code. We will then discuss the effect of asymmetric exchange operations on this code in the next subsection.

As stated previously [63], we will not consider the errors of type (38) or (29) as elements of the algebra which would cause irrevocable loss of information (note, however, that one could in principle remove them by symmetrizing with respect to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$). In addition, we have previously classified basis elements Eq. (24) as logical operations which give rise to logical errors when they are contained in the error algebra. The elements of the form Eq. (21) are a basis for the leakage type errors, while terms of the form Eq. (25), (26) and (27) are collective operations and will not affect the DFS encoded states. The two diagonal elements (37) do not cause leakage and do not add anything beyond logical type errors. The remaining operations need to be interpreted.

After some consideration, it is clear that the S_{X_i}, S_{Y_i} operators are actually elements of the stabilizer subgroup. For a DFS this is defined as [11]

$$\hat{D}(\vec{v}) = \exp \left[\sum_{\alpha} v_{\alpha} (\hat{S}_{\alpha} - I \otimes M_{\alpha}) \right] \quad (40)$$

where the elements of the vector $\vec{v}$, v_{α} are complex numbers, the $\hat{S}_{\alpha}$ come from the set which generates the collective error algebra $\mathcal{A}$ (we can include H_S as S_0) and M_{α} is a matrix which only mixes non-code indices. Thus the linear combinations that are used in the sum in the argument of the exponential will span the space of the primitives in the collective errors and the S_{X_i}, S_{Y_i} are included in these linear combinations. Another way in which to see that these operators do not affect the code space is by acting with them on the code. The terms in S_{X_i} , and S_{Y_i} of the form $(I + \tilde{Z}) **$ are the only ones which act on the code space (with no effect), the others act on the orthogonal complement $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. Thus these operations do not affect the code and are thus elements of the stabilizer.

The remaining errors (39) are products of elements of the logical operations and the collective operations. In this case $g \sim \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}'$ which is a product of an operator which does nothing to the code (a stabilizer element) and a logical error.

Now that the complete set of basis elements spanning the three-qubit DFS has been explicitly represented, and we have identified the action of these operators on the code, we may discuss their significance in a more practical setting. We will next decompose the errors that are seen as obstacles to building practical solid state quantum computing systems and discuss the affect of these errors in terms of the complete set of operations on the code space.

F. Errors in Quantum Dot Qubits

A dominant type of error in solid-state quantum dot quantum computing architectures arises from spin-orbit interactions [72]. Spin-orbit interactions couple charge

degrees of freedom associated with the orbital wave functions to the spin degrees of freedom used to store and manipulate information. Since charge often interacts much more strongly with the environment [73], spin-orbit interactions give rise to decoherence in these devices.

There are several ways in which to treat the gating errors which arise due to anisotropic exchange interactions. One way is to treat them with a QECC, which, as stated in the introduction, requires a substantial qubit overhead. A second way is to use shaped pulses [58]. A third way is to use dressed qubits [74]. The spin-orbit interaction can also be used to construct a universal gate set [75, 76]. Here we assume the form of spin-orbit interactions which give rise to errors which are of the same form as the asymmetric, or anisotropic exchange. However, we treat these as decohering (causing information loss), rather than unitary errors.

Consider a bilinear coupling in the physical basis of the form

$$H_{SB}^{(2)} = \sum_{i < j} \sum_{\alpha, \beta = \{x, y, z\}} g_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_j^\beta \otimes B_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (41)$$

where $g_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ is a rank-2 tensor. The symmetrization procedure of [34], that prepares collective decoherence conditions, applies only to linear coupling, so will not work in this case. In this case we must consider the possibility of leakage. The bilinear term $g_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_j^\beta$ can be decomposed into (i) a scalar $g_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j$, which is proportional to the Heisenberg exchange operator and thus has the effect of logical errors E ; (ii) a rank-1 tensor

$$\vec{\beta} \cdot (\vec{\sigma}_i \times \vec{\sigma}_j); \quad (42)$$

(iii) a rank-1 tensor

$$(\vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\gamma}_i) (\vec{\sigma}_j \cdot \vec{\gamma}_j) \quad (43)$$

which cannot couple the two $S = 1/2$ states to each other, but can couple them to $S = 3/2$ states causing leakage. Thus we see that the $S = 3/2$ subspace acts as a source for leakage [from (ii) and (iii)], and that there is also the possibility of (non-collective) errors [from (ii)] which do not have the same effect on the $|0_L\rangle, |1_L\rangle$ states and therefore cause logical errors. Clearly, higher-order interactions $H_{SB}^{(n)}$ with $n > 2$ can cause similar leakage and logical errors.

We will now examine the errors (42) and (43) in the basis for encoded operations and thus identify their effect on the code space. To be specific, the errors in Eqs. (42) and (43) will be transformed into the tilde basis, which acts on the code space, by $U_{dfs} E_s U_{dfs}^\dagger$, where E_s is either of the form (42) or (43). We will then decompose these operations in the DFS (tilde) basis of Section IV D. Let us first consider errors of the form (42). We will consider only at the errors on physical qubits one and two and neglect errors of the type (21). After omitting these two types of errors, the remaining errors are of the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [\beta_{12}^x (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{X} + \beta_{12}^y (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{Y} + \beta_{12}^z (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{Z}]. \quad (44)$$

Assuming that we can remove leakage errors using an appropriate LEO, our goal is to analyze the remaining errors to see how they affect the encoded qubits.

Note first that in Eq. (44) we are examining errors caused by interactions between qubits one and two. If only errors between qubits one and two are present, there exists an inherent asymmetry in the noise, thus we would not expect a DFS to protect against this type of error. However, it turns out that the basis elements (primitives) here are the same as those found in the interactions between qubits two and three and in qubits one and three. Cancellation or partial cancellation of this type of error will occur when the interactions between pairs of qubits have combine to form only stabilizer operations, a situation which could be achieved through material/environment engineering or by dynamical decoupling symmetrization with respect to the code space. Here we will only consider the asymmetric case of a pair of qubits (qubits 1 and 2).

How should we interpret the errors in Eq. (44)? Consider the first term. Examining the logical errors, we see that the error present in Eq. (44) is proportional to $\vec{\sigma}_y \times S_X$ less those terms which are of the form $(I - \tilde{Z}) **$. Thus it is a logical Y multiplied by a collective X error less those errors which act only on $C^\perp$. The other terms are also proportional to a logical Y operation. This indicates that we may protect against all of the remaining errors with the concatenation of this DFS by a QECC which protects against logical Y errors. This can be accomplished by using a 3-to-1 QECC encoding. This may well be a significant advantage over a pure QECC given available resources in solid-state implementations of quantum computing.

Now we examine errors of the form (43). Here, as before, we will analyze only the affect of this type of error on physical qubits one and two. We will also again omit the leakage errors which are of the form (21). The remaining 10 terms of the DFS transformed errors (43) are

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\gamma_1^x \gamma_2^x - \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^y}{2\sqrt{3}} (I - \tilde{Z}) \tilde{X} I + \frac{\gamma_1^y \gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^x \gamma_2^y}{2\sqrt{3}} (I - \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} I \\ & + \frac{(-\gamma_1^z \gamma_2^y + \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^z)}{2\sqrt{3}} (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{X} + \frac{\gamma_1^z \gamma_2^x - \gamma_1^x \gamma_2^z}{2\sqrt{3}} (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{Y} \\ & + \frac{-\gamma_1^y \gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^x \gamma_2^y}{2\sqrt{3}} (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Y} \tilde{Z} \\ & + \frac{1}{3} (-\gamma_1^x \gamma_2^x - \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^y - \gamma_1^z \gamma_2^z) (I + \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Z} I \\ & + \frac{\gamma_1^z \gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^x \gamma_2^z}{2\sqrt{3}} (I - \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Z} \tilde{X} + \frac{(\gamma_1^z \gamma_2^y + \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^z)}{2\sqrt{3}} (I - \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Z} \tilde{Y} \\ & + \frac{1}{6} (-\gamma_1^x \gamma_2^x - \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^y + 2\gamma_1^z \gamma_2^z) (I - \tilde{Z}) \tilde{Z} \tilde{Z} \\ & + \frac{1}{3} (-\gamma_1^x \gamma_2^x - \gamma_1^y \gamma_2^y - \gamma_1^z \gamma_2^z) \tilde{Z} I I. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Terms 1,2,7,8,9 act on $C^\perp$ and thus have no affect on the code. Term 10 is a combination of exchange operations which does not affect the code subspace. Terms

3,4,5,6 act on the code space. They act either as a logical error (term 6) or as a logical error composed with a collective error. The logical errors must be treated using other methods. In this case, we see that all errors other than term 6 give rise to logical Y errors. To remove all errors in the system, we have different choices which could be good alternatives depending upon the physical system. First, we could eliminate the errors using more decoupling pulses. Second, we could choose a system where the term 6 is negligible. This would enable complete elimination of the errors with one other decoupling pulse. Third, if term 6 is negligible, we could treat the Y errors with the concatenation of the DFS with a QECC. The required QECC would use only three qubits to encode one.

Physical implementations will dictate whether decoupling pulses, materials engineering, or a QECC is a valid option for the elimination of remaining errors after leakage has been removed.

V. LEOS AND THE 4-QUBIT DFS

The four qubit DFS encodes one logical qubit using a subspace of four physical qubits. It protects a single logical qubit from collective errors of any type (bit-flip, phase-flip, or both). It has been shown that the exchange interaction is sufficient for implementing a universal set of gating operations on this system while preserving the DFS [11]. In this section we will answer the following questions: 1) Is there an LEO available in solid-state implementations of qubits which relies on the exchange interaction? 2) Is there a canonical set of such gates? 3) After leakage is removed, can we completely remove all errors in asymmetric exchange, and if so, how?

A. The Four-qubit DFS

The four-qubit DFS contains two singlet states for the representative qubit, three triplets and a spin 2, or quintuplet. The singlet states, which represent the logical zero and one of the DFS encoded qubit are given by

$$S^0 = |0_L\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0101\rangle + |1010\rangle - |0110\rangle - |1001\rangle) \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S^1 &= |1_L\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}}(2|0011\rangle + 2|1100\rangle \\ &\quad - |0110\rangle - |1001\rangle - |0101\rangle - |1010\rangle), \quad (47) \end{aligned}$$

where as before, e.g., $|0101\rangle = |1/2\rangle \otimes |-1/2\rangle \otimes |1/2\rangle \otimes |-1/2\rangle$ in the standard angular momentum basis. S^0 and S_1 comprise the code space $\mathcal{C}$ for this DFS and the remaining states are the states in $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

The triplet states are given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11}^1 &= |11\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0100\rangle + |1000\rangle - |0001\rangle - |0010\rangle) \\ T_{10}^1 &= |10\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1100\rangle - |0011\rangle) \\ T_{1-1}^1 &= |1-1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|1110\rangle + |1101\rangle - |1011\rangle - |0111\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11}^2 &= |11\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0001\rangle - |0010\rangle) \\ T_{10}^2 &= |10\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|1001\rangle + |0101\rangle - |1010\rangle - |0110\rangle) \\ T_{1-1}^2 &= |1-1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1101\rangle - |1110\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11}^3 &= |11\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0100\rangle - |1000\rangle) \\ T_{10}^3 &= |10\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0110\rangle + |0101\rangle - |1010\rangle - |1001\rangle) \\ T_{1-1}^3 &= |1-1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0111\rangle - |1011\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The spin-2 representation is given by the following set of states (a quintuplet)

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{22} &= |22\rangle = |0000\rangle \\ Q_{21} &= |10\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|1000\rangle + |0100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0001\rangle) \\ Q_{20} &= |1-1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|1100\rangle + |1010\rangle \\ &\quad + |1001\rangle + |0110\rangle + |0101\rangle + |0011\rangle) \\ Q_{2-1} &= |2-1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0111\rangle + |1011\rangle + |1101\rangle + |1110\rangle) \\ Q_{2-2} &= |2-2\rangle = |1111\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We will refer to this set of states as the set of DFS states with the logical elements comprising $\mathcal{C}$ and the other states (T and Q states) comprising $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. In the latter part of this section we will again use a DFS basis for the operators and a transformation U_{dfs} to change from the computational basis set of states and operators to the DFS sets. Let us now discuss logical operations on the DFS.

B. Gate Operations and LEOs

Physical gates were given in Ref. [11] and shown to be compatible with the DFS. These are given by the exchange interaction between pairs of physical qubits. The logical “ X ” operation is given by

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(E_{23} - E_{13}) \quad (52)$$

where, again, E_{ij} is the exchange operation between qubits i and j , and I_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix. The logical “ Z ” operation is given by

$$\bar{Z} = -E_{12} \quad (53)$$

and $\bar{Y}$ can be obtained from these two. However, there is a distinct difference between this set of logical operations and the analogous set in Section IV. The difference is that naturally occurring logical operations on the three-qubit DFS have eigenvalue zero on the states in $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. This is not the case for the four-qubit DFS. For example, all states in $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ have eigenvalues of $+1$ for states in $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, with the exception of T^3 whose states have eigenvalue -1 when acted on by $\bar{Z}$. These gates are not “canonical” in our sense and so the projection onto the code subspace is not automatic. One must either use another set of gating operations which are projective or use the generalized LEO of Section III B. We explore each of these two possibilities in the next two subsections.

C. An LEO from Exchange

As noted in [37] there exists physically available operations which are “canonical” in many circumstances, meaning that they are projective onto the code subspace. The definition of $\bar{Z}$ given in [11] (and the previous section) is not canonical. We therefore seek to construct a physically available LEO. We do this using the definition of the generalized LEO given in Section III B.

Let the (square of the) total spin angular momentum operator be denoted $\bar{S}^2$ with eigenvalue $S(S+1)$. Then

$$4\bar{S}^2 = \left(\sum_i \vec{\sigma}_i \right)^2,$$

where $\vec{\sigma}_i = (\sigma_i^x, \sigma_i^y, \sigma_i^z)$ are the Pauli matrices acting on the i^{th} qubit. Therefore

$$S^2/2 = \frac{12 + 2 \sum_{i < j} \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j}{8}$$

gives an appropriate LEO of the form given in Eq. (9). This can be seen as follows. On the $S = 0$ (singlet) subspaces the operator gives zero. On the $S = 1$ subspaces the operator gives 1 and on the $S = 3$ subspace it gives 3. Therefore the appropriate LEO is given by

$$R_L = \exp\{-i\pi S^2/2\},$$

which reproduces the LEO of Eq. (9).

Now consider a modified set of logical operations:

$$\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{X}' = \bar{X} + S^2/2, \quad (54)$$

$$\bar{Y} \rightarrow \bar{Y}' = \bar{Y} + S^2/2, \quad (55)$$

$$\bar{Z} \rightarrow \bar{Z}' = \bar{Z} + S^2/2. \quad (56)$$

This set may be used to obtain a appropriate LEO by exponentiation, e.g.

$$R_L = \exp\{-i\pi(\bar{Z}')\}.$$

Similarly we can construce an LEO using $\bar{X}'$ or $\bar{Y}'$. Since the operator S^2 is composed of exchange interactions, it is also experimentally available.

D. A canonical LEO from exchange

One may ask the question: what set of gates would be canonical if we use only exchange operations? One way to answer this question is to do the following calculation. Start with operations which act as $\bar{X}$, $\bar{Y}$ and $\bar{Z}$ and have eigenvalue zero on the states in $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. These are operators in the DFS (i.e., the tilde) basis. Then use the DFS transformation to transform from the DFS basis back to the physical basis to find the set of physical interactions necessary to perform canonical gating operations. We now use this procedure to find such an LEO.

The DFS basis for this system has logical operations which transform between the two one-dimensional spin-0 representations. These may be represented by ordinary Pauli matrices which act only on the 2×2 block. The operations which perform these logical operations are labelled using the spin-0 index and a 0, 1 degeneracy index, $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda_1, \lambda, 2}^{0,0}$, which in this case has only a single entry for each pair $\lambda_1, \lambda, 2$. According to the definition, canonical logical operations would have the following form in the DFS basis:

$$\bar{\sigma}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_i & 0_{14 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times 14} & 0_{14 \times 14} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (57)$$

where $0_{m \times n}$ is an $m \times n$ matrix of zeros. This operation acts simultaneously as a projector onto the code subspace and a Pauli operator on the encoded state. Now, let the DFS transformation be given by U_{dfs} , the computational basis states be given by $|\psi_c\rangle$, and the DFS states be given by $|\psi_{dfs}\rangle$:

$$U_{dfs} |\psi_c\rangle = |\psi_{dfs}\rangle. \quad (58)$$

Then the logical operations are related to the operations in the computational basis by

$$\bar{\sigma}_i |\psi_{dfs}\rangle = U_{dfs} \bar{\sigma}_i^c |\psi_c\rangle, \quad (59)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}_i$ is the canonical logical operation in the logical basis and $\bar{\sigma}_i^c$ is the logical operation in the computational basis. This physical realization of the canonical operations will be found using

$$U_{dfs}^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_i U_{dfs} = \bar{\sigma}_i^c. \quad (60)$$

Using only the exchange operations between qubits i and j , $E_{ij} = I + \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j$, the canonical operations are given by

$$\bar{\sigma}_x^c = (2I - E_{13})(2I - E_{24}) - (2I - E_{23})(2I - E_{14}) \quad (61)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_z^c = & 2(2I - E_{34})(2I - E_{12}) - (2I - E_{13})(2I - E_{24}) \\ & - (2I - E_{23})(2I - E_{14}) \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

and the commutator of these two gives the third logical element. It is clear from this form that 4-body interactions are required to construct canonical logical operations using only exchange operations. Although there are methods for constructing these from more fundamental interactions [77, 78] so that they may be useful for some quantum computing purposes (e.g. simulations) they are likely impractical for BB controls due to time constraints. Alternatively, it has been shown that these four-body interactions naturally arise in some systems with significant effect and it has been suggested that one might take advantage of these effects when designing gating operations [79].

E. Errors in quantum dot qubits

The detailed analysis of Section IV becomes much more complicated for the four-qubit DFS. The set of operators for the Hilbert space of four qubits contains $(2^4)^2 = 2^8 = 256$ basis elements. This set obviously becomes prohibitively large for such a detailed analysis as the number of qubits grows. However, there are several key observations which summarize our three-qubit analysis which are quite general. (These can also be seen from the algebraic decomposition of Section II B.) We can see that the operations in the DFS basis may be classified as follows: Logical operations, operations on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, collective operations, leakage operations, products of one or more of these types. As in the treatment of the 3-qubit DFS, we will assume that the LEO can be implemented so that leakage errors are irrelevant. In this case, we need only remove logical operations (this will also remove operations which are products of logical operations and another type). Therefore our goal is to identify logical operations and then extract those operators in the spin-orbit coupling terms which give rise to logical type errors, whether or not they are combined with collective errors.

The extraction of logical operations and operations which are products of logical operations with another are readily performed with **MATHEMATICA**. We note first that with an ordered logical, or DFS, basis which contains the first two entries $|0_L\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle$, will have logical basis elements for the algebra of the form

$$(I - \tilde{X})(I - \tilde{Y})(I - \tilde{Z})\mathcal{O}_i, \quad (63)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_i \in \{\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}\}$. This implies that from Section III, B is a 2×2 matrix, C is a 14×14 matrix, E is 2×14 and $E^\perp$ is 14×2 .

Again we decompose the DFS transformed terms of the form Eqs. (42) and (43) in terms of the DFS basis elements. In this case the representations used for the DFS

states are not completely symmetric in the four qubits. We must therefore consider two pairs of interactions, the interactions between qubits one and two, and between qubits two and three.

The error arising from Eq. (42) between physical qubits 1 and 2, and neglecting leakage operations and operations on $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, consists of just one term:

$$-\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}(\gamma_1^x\gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^y\gamma_2^y + \gamma_1^z\gamma_2^z)(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z}. \quad (64)$$

There are two different terms for the Eq. (43) when acting between qubits 2 and 3:

$$\frac{1}{6\sqrt{2}}(\gamma_1^x\gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^y\gamma_2^y + \gamma_1^z\gamma_2^z)(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})\tilde{Z} \quad (65)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_1^x\gamma_2^x + \gamma_1^y\gamma_2^y + \gamma_1^z\gamma_2^z)(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})(I + \tilde{Z})\tilde{X}. \quad (66)$$

A rather stark difference between the three-qubit DFS and the four-qubit DFS is the fact that no errors of the form Eq. (43) contribute to logical errors on this code. We therefore need not correct this type of error. These type of errors occur in zinc-blend type semiconductor structures which have a broken inversion symmetry. Knowing that removing all leakage errors can render this type of error insignificant is a important advantage of this code.

Therefore, we again can correct all errors of the forms in Eqs. (42) and (43) with the concatenation of a three-qubit QECC or with one added decoupling pulse. However, we see that the antisymmetric term, also known as a Dzyaloshinski-Moriya term, is not present after the implementation of an appropriate LEO. Therefore, if this term is a dominant source of errors in a particular implementation of quantum dot quantum computing, then we recommend the four-qubit DFS over the three qubit DFS.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have given methods for the implementation of leakage elimination operators LEOs which are, in many circumstances, physically available in experiments. These LEOs eliminate a large and important class of errors; those that would serve to destroy a subspace encoding. The methods for producing these have shown promise in many experiments and here we have generalized the method for producing such LEOs.

Symmetrization by dynamical decoupling can be performed by decoupling the code from its orthogonal subspace or the orthogonal subspace from the code. In the first case, we can, in principle, remove all errors from the code space. While this is not true when the decoupling is performed with respect to the orthogonal subspace, the

advantage of this method is that it does not introduce further errors if imperfect decoupling controls are used.

For the three- and four-qubit DFSs, we have given a method for producing LEOs using the exchange interaction which is physically available in solid-state qubit implementations of quantum computing. We have shown that after leakage errors have been removed, the remaining bilinear couplings which could give rise to errors may be treated with either a QECC or cycle involving one extra decoupling pulse. In this case we can, in fact, produce the conditions for a DFS even when no symmetry is present in the original system. The four-qubit DFS has an advantage in this regard over the three-qubit

DFS since eliminating leakage errors from the four-qubit DFS removes the Dzyaloshinski-Moriya interaction errors which are present in many semiconductors which have a broken inversion symmetry and are the main part of the anisotropic exchange interaction.

Acknowledgments

D.A.L. acknowledges financial support from AFOSR (F49620-01-1-0468), the Sloan Foundation, NSERC, and the Connaught Fund.

-
- [1] P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 2493 (1995).
 - [2] A.R. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996).
 - [3] A. Steane, Rep. Prog. Phys. **61**, 117 (1998).
 - [4] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1862 (1996).
 - [5] D. Gottesman, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA (1997), eprint quant-ph/9705052.
 - [6] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 900 (1997).
 - [7] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3306 (1997).
 - [8] L.-M Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 737 (1998).
 - [9] D.A. Lidar, I.L. Chuang and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2594 (1998).
 - [10] E. Knill, R. Laflamme and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2525 (2000).
 - [11] J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D.A. Lidar, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042307 (2001).
 - [12] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022306 (2001).
 - [13] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 2733 (1998).
 - [14] M. Ban, J. Mod. Opt. **45**, 2315 (1998).
 - [15] L.-M. Duan and G. Guo, Phys. Lett. A **261**, 139 (1999).
 - [16] L. Viola, E. Knill and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).
 - [17] P. Zanardi, Phys. Lett. A **258**, 77 (1999).
 - [18] D. Vitali and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4178 (1999).
 - [19] M.S. Byrd and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012324 (2003).
 - [20] L. Viola, S. Lloyd and E. Knill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4888 (1999).
 - [21] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3520 (2000).
 - [22] D. Vitali and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012305 (2002).
 - [23] M. S. Byrd and D.A. Lidar, Qu. Inf. Proc. **1**, 19 (2001).
 - [24] D.G. Cory, R. Laflamme, E. Knill, L. Viola, T.F. Havel, N. Boulant, G. Boutis, E. Fortunato, S. Lloyd, R. Martinez, C. Negrevergne, M. Pravia, Y. Sharf, G. Teklemariam, Y.S. Weinstein, W.H. Zurek, Fortschritte der Physik **48**, 875 (2000).
 - [25] G.S. Agarwal, M.O. Scully and H. Walther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4271 (2001).
 - [26] C. Uchiyama and M. Aihara, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032313 (2002).
 - [27] C. Uchiyama and M. Aihara, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 052302 (2003).
 - [28] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4556 (1999).
 - [29] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **60**, R729 (1999).
 - [30] L. Viola, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012307 (2002).
 - [31] M. S. Byrd and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 047901 (2002).
 - [32] M.S. Byrd and D.A. Lidar, J. Mod. Optics **50**, 1285 (2002).
 - [33] G. Alber, Th. Beth, Ch. Charnes, A. Delgado, M. Grassl, and M. Mussinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4402 (2001).
 - [34] L.-A. Wu and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 207902 (2002).
 - [35] K. Khodjasteh and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 197904 (2002).
 - [36] D.A. Lidar and L.-A. Wu, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032313 (2003).
 - [37] L.-A. Wu, M.S. Byrd, D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 127901 (2002).
 - [38] Y. Zhang, Z.-W. Zhou, B. Yu and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 042315 (2004).
 - [39] M. S. Byrd, L.-A. Wu, D. A. Lidar (2004), quant-ph/0402098.
 - [40] D. Bacon, J. Kempe, D.A. Lidar and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1758 (2000).
 - [41] D. Bacon, J. Kempe, D. A. Lidar, K. B. Whaley, and D. P. DiVincenzo, in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Experimental Implementations of Quantum Computation*, edited by R. Clark (Rinton, Princeton, NJ, 2001), p. 257, quant-ph/0102140.
 - [42] D.P. DiVincenzo, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, G. Burkard, and K. B. Whaley, Nature **408**, 339 (2000).
 - [43] J. Levy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002).
 - [44] S. C. Benjamin, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 054303 (2001).
 - [45] L.-A. Wu and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **65** (2002).
 - [46] D.A. Lidar and L.-A. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002).
 - [47] J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D.P. DiVincenzo and K.B. Whaley, Qu. Inf. & Comp. **1**, 33 (2002).
 - [48] J. Kempe and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052330 (2002).
 - [49] D.A. Lidar, L.-A. Wu, A. Blais, Qu. Inf. Proc. **1**, 155 (2002).
 - [50] M. Mohseni, D.A. Lidar (2004), quant-ph/0406198.
 - [51] L. Viola (2004), quant-ph/0404038.
 - [52] P. Facchi, S. Tasaki, S. Pascazio, H. Nakazato, A. Tokuse,

- D.A. Lidar (2004), quant-ph/0403205.
- [53] L. Viola and E. Knill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 037901 (2003).
 - [54] K. Shiokawa and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 030302(R) (2004).
 - [55] L. Faoro, L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 117905 (2004).
 - [56] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012301 (2002).
 - [57] P. Zanardi and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003).
 - [58] L. Tian and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 050301 (2000).
 - [59] J. Preskill, in *Introduction to Quantum Computation and Information*, edited by H.K. Lo, S. Popescu and T.P. Spiller (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
 - [60] J.P. Palao, R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062308 (2003).
 - [61] J.P. Palao, R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 059901 (2004).
 - [62] S.E. Sklarz, D.J. Tannor (2003), quant-ph/0404081.
 - [63] In the case that we are discussing elements of the error algebra in the Kraus representation which are elements of $\mathcal{A}$, these actually correspond to projections onto the space orthogonal to projections onto $C^\perp$. However, we don't want to consider these here. We will consider their exponentials.
 - [64] We should emphasize that although we are discussing a bang-bang pulse sequence, our arguments hold for any suitable set of decoupling pulses.
 - [65] J. Preskill, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **454**, 385 (1998).
 - [66] E. Knill, R. Laflamme and W. Zurek, Science **279**, 342 (1998).
 - [67] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G.J. Milburn, Nature **409**, 46 (2001).
 - [68] A. Bohm, *Quantum Mechanics: Foundations and Applications, 3rd Ed., Chapter 5* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993).
 - [69] J.-Y. Hsieh, C.-M. Li (2004), quant-ph/0405038.
 - [70] We note that the corresponding Eq. (74) in Ref. [11] contains incorrect numerical factors, which we have fixed here.
 - [71] We are referring to trace orthogonality, i.e., using the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product.
 - [72] K.V. Kavokin, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 075305 (2001).
 - [73] G. Burkard, D. Loss and D.P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 2070 (1999).
 - [74] L.-A. Wu, D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 097904 (2003).
 - [75] L.-A. Wu, D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 062314 (2002).
 - [76] D. Stepanenko, N. E. Bonesteel (2004), quant-ph/0403023.
 - [77] X. Wang, P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032327 (2002).
 - [78] L.-A. Wu, M.S. Byrd and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 057904 (2002).
 - [79] A. Mizel, D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 077903 (2004).